

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

JOHN ARMSTRONG, et al.,

No. C 94-2307 CW

Plaintiffs,

ORDER REVISING THE
MODIFIED
INJUNCTION
(Docket No. 2180)

v.

EDMUND G. BROWN, JR., et al.,

Defendants.

_____/

This order revises Sections D.2. and D.3. of this Court's Modified Injunction (Docket No. 2180). It is made pursuant to the Ninth Circuit's recent opinion in Armstrong v. Brown, 2014 WL 4783091 (9th Cir.) In that opinion, the Ninth Circuit held that Sections D.2. and D.3. of this Court's Modified Injunction delegated too much authority to the Court-appointed expert witness to resolve disputes between Plaintiffs' counsel and the State. It then vacated those sections, and instructed this Court to revise those sections to be consistent with its opinion.

BACKGROUND

Section D.2. provides the procedure to be used with regard to disputed allegations of non-compliance. It provides, in relevant part, "If the parties are unable to resolve the dispute informally, Plaintiffs' counsel may request that the Court's expert review and resolve the matter." Armstrong v. Brown, 2012 WL 3638675, at *11 (N.D. Cal.), aff'd in part, vacated in part, remanded, by 2014 WL 4783091 (9th Cir.). Furthermore, it states, "Administrative decisions made by the Court's expert pursuant to

1 this section shall be final as between Plaintiffs and Defendants."

2 Id.

3 Section D.3. provides, in relevant part, that with regard to
4 incidents in dispute as presented in the parties' pleadings, the
5 Plaintiffs "shall attempt to resolve these disputes through
6 negotiation with Defendants. If negotiations fail, the disputes
7 may be referred to the Court's expert pursuant to paragraph D.2.,
8 above." Id.

9 The Ninth Circuit held that this delegation of authority to
10 the Court's expert is "impermissible" as it extends "beyond the
11 scope of the duties that may be assigned to a Rule 706 expert."
12 Armstrong, 2014 WL 4783091, at * 10 ("While we have approved the
13 appointment of non-judicial officers to make recommendations and
14 resolve disputes ancillary to complex litigation, those
15 appointments specifically limited the expert to making
16 recommendations subject to review by the district court.").

17 Accordingly, the Court revises the modified injunction as
18 follows:

19 In Section D.2., strike the following sentence:
20 "Administrative decisions made by the Court's expert pursuant to
21 this section shall be final as between Plaintiffs and Defendants"
22 and replace it as follows: "Administrative recommendations made by
23 the Court's expert pursuant to this section shall be reviewable by
24 this Court on a motion by any party dissatisfied with the expert's
25 decision. The review shall be conducted pursuant to the
26 requirements of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) (1) (C), the procedure for the
27 review of a report and recommendation by a magistrate judge."
28

1 Because Section D.3. derives its meaning from Section D.2., there
2 is no reason to alter its language.

3 CONCLUSION

4 Within seven days of this order, Plaintiffs shall prepare and
5 submit, for the Court's review, a second modified injunction
6 incorporating these changes.

7
8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9
10 Dated: December 5, 2014


11 CLAUDIA WILKEN
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28